IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 1468 OF 2007

Shobha Parshuram Bhandari .. Petitioner.

V/s.

1.State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.

Mr.A.D.Magadum for the Petitioner.

Mr.R.D.Rane, Government Pleade for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr.Amit Borkar for the Respondent No.4.

CORAM : F.I. REBELLO AND
R.M. SAVANT, JJ.

DATED : 16TH MARCH, 2007.

P.C.:

. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. Though there is some infirmity in the order of the Committee to the extent of placing reliance on the judgment in the case of Raviprakash Babulalsingh Parmar Vs. State of Maharashtra (2004 (1) Mah.L.J.177, which has been reversed by the Supreme Court, from the record we find that the petitioner's caste in her school record was shown as 'Hindu Maratha' and that of his brother has been shown as 'Hindu Chambhar'; similar is that of her cousins. In respect of her grand-father, there is a serious dispute and it was pointed out that the

certificate subsequently produced, had a mobile number and that by itself indicates that the said document was a fradulent document. This was accepted by the Committee. Insofar as the father's record is concerned, it was found that the record shows his caste as 'Hindu Chambhar, Bhandari', but the word 'Chambhar; had been tampered and there the word 'Bhandari' has been written afterwards. The petitioner sought time to give clarification of the said document as noted by the Committee, but instead of giving clarifications, the petitioner contended that the copies of the school leaving certificates of her relatives were bogus. The Committee otherwise considered various documents on record and after having scrutinized the same, has come to the conclusion that the caste certificate issued in favour of the petitioner, would not have been issued and consequently, rejected the petitioner's caste claim.

2. On considering of the order of the Committee and the findings recorded therein, we are of the opinion that the findings are neither perverse nor the order suffers from any error apparent on the face of the record, warranting an interference as called for. In this view of the matter, the petition is rejected.

(F.I.REBELLO,J.)

(R.M.SAVANT,J.)